

- (1) The first definition is not correct because the impure worldly environment is a truth of suffering but it does not accord with the first definition. The impure worldly environment is a truth of suffering because Asanga says in his ***Abhidharma-samuccaya (Compendium of Knowledge)***:
What is the truth of suffering? One should be aware that it constitutes sentient beings taking birth and the world that they are born into.

The impure worldly environment does not accord with the definition because it is not a fruitional result. It is not a fruitional result because it does not exist in the continuum of a sentient being. Whatever is a fruitional result must necessarily exist in the continuum of a sentient being because Vasubhandu says in his ***Abhidharmakosha (Treasure of Knowledge)***:
Express a sentient being

Furthermore, the first definition is not correct because non-virtuous karma is a truth of suffering but it does not accord with the definition. Non-virtuous karma is a truth of suffering because it is a truth of origin. It is a truth of origin because it is a karmic truth of origin. A non-virtuous karma is a karmic truth of origin because it is karma that is subsumed under cyclic existence. However, non-virtuous karma does not accord with the first definition because it is not a fruitional effect. It is not a fruitional effect because it is not neutral. Whatever is not neutral is necessarily not a fruitional effect because Vasubhandu says in his ***Abhidharmakosha (Treasure of Knowledge)***:
Fruitional [effects] are neutral phenomena

- (2) The second definition is not correct because attachment that facilitates birth in the higher (form or formless) realm is a truth of origin but it does not accord with the second definition. It does not accord with the second definition because it is not a fruitional cause. Attachment that facilitates birth in the higher (form- or formless) realm is not a fruitional cause because it is neither a non-virtue nor a contaminated virtue.
Whatever is neither a non-virtue nor a contaminated virtue is necessarily not a fruitional cause because Vasubhandu says in his ***Abhidharmakosha (Treasure of Knowledge)***:
*Fruitional causes can only either be non-virtues
Or contaminated virtues.*

Attachment that facilitates birth in the higher (form or formless) realm is neither a non-virtue nor a contaminated virtue because it is neutral. It is neutral because it is a delusion that pertains to the higher (form or formless) realm. Whatever is a delusion that pertains to the higher (form or formless) realm is necessarily neutral because Vasubhandu says in his ***Abhidharmakosha (Treasure of Knowledge)***:
All the higher are neutral.

- (3) The third definition is not correct because a truth of cessation that exists at the same time as a truth of the path does not accord with the third definition. It does not accord with the third definition because it is not '*an analytical cessation that is the nominal effect of a truth of the path*'. A truth of cessation that exists at the same time as a truth of the path is not '*an analytical cessation that is the nominal effect of a truth of the path*' because it is not the nominal effect of a truth of the path. It is not the nominal effect of a truth of the path because it exists at the same time as a truth of the path. However, if something is the nominal effect of a truth of the path it must come into existence when a truth of the path has gone out of existence because the cause must precede the effect, and cause and effect cannot exist at the same time.
- (4) The fourth definition is not correct because a truth of the path that exists at the same time as a truth of cessation does not accord with the fourth definition. The reasoning is the same as above.

- Someone says: "(It is asserted that) there is no non-virtue that pertains to the higher (form or formless) realms because whatever is a delusion that pertains to the higher (form or formless) realm is necessarily neutral. However, this is not correct because in the higher realms there are beings that hold the wrong view asserting that Brahma is the creator of sentient beings."

There is no fault because whatever is the wrong view that is one of the ten non-virtues is necessarily a *deprecating* wrong view. However, the wrong view asserting that Brahma is the creator of sentient beings is a *superimposing* wrong view.

- Someone says: "(1) The definition of the truth of suffering is '*a contaminated aggregate that is the result of its cause, contaminated karma and delusions*' and (2) the definition of the truth of origin is '*an aggregate that issues forth suffering for its fruitional result*'."

(1) The first definition is not correct because Hearer Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder accord with the first definition but are not truths of suffering.

Hearer Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder accord with the first definition because their contaminated physical aggregates accord with the first definition, and because the direct causes of Hearer Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder and the direct causes of those Arhats' contaminated physical aggregates are equivalent.

Hearer Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder are not truths of suffering because they are Arhats.

(2) The second definition is not correct because projecting karma that determines rebirth as a celestial being of the desire realm is a truth of origin but it does not accord with the second definition. Projecting karma that determines rebirth as a celestial being of the desire realm is a truth of origin because it is a karma that is subsumed under cyclic existence.

However, projecting karma that determines rebirth as a celestial being of the desire realm does not accord with the second definition because it does not issue forth suffering. It does not issue forth suffering because it is virtuous.

- Someone says: "Whatever is karma is necessarily contaminated karma."

That is not correct because in the continua of Buddhas there is karma. In the continua of Buddhas there is karma because in the continua of Buddhas there is intentional karma. In the continua of Buddhas there is intentional karma because every main mind is associated with intentional karma, i.e. with the omnipresent mental factor of intention.

- Someone says: "It follows that there is a something that is both, karma and a sense consciousness,"

The reply from our own system is: "Yes, we assert that."

- Someone says: "(1) The definition of the truth of suffering is '*an assemblage that is the four: impermanent, suffering, empty, and selfless*', (2) the definition of the truth of origin is '*an assemblage that is the four: a cause, origin, strong production, and condition*', (3) the definition of the truth of cessation is '*an assemblage that is the four: a cessation, pacification, auspicious highness, and definite emergence*', and (4) the definition of the truth of the path is '*an assemblage that is the four: a path, suitability, achiever, and deliverance*'."

(1) The first definition is not correct because Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder accord with the definition but are not truths of suffering. Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder accord with the definition because they possess the four attributes. They possess the aspect of impermanence because they are impermanent; they possess the aspect of suffering because they have contaminated aggregates that are in the nature of suffering, they possess the aspect of being empty because they are empty of a permanent, partless, independent self; they possess the aspect of being selfless because they lack a self-sufficient, substantially existent self.

(2) The second definition is not correct because the mundane Devadatta accords with the second definition but he is not a truth of origin. The mundane Devadatta accords with the definition because he possesses the four aspects (he is a cause, an origin, etc.). However, he is not a truth of origin because he is neither contaminated karma nor a delusion nor a contaminated physical aggregate etc.

